

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 8 and 51 were objected to for lack of antecedent basis; claim 45 was rejected for using ELGILOY; claims 1-4,6, 11-13, 15, 27-30, 34, 60 and 64 were rejected as anticipated by Kolenc, claims 17-23 were rejected as anticipated by Ejiri; claims 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 54 and 56-59 were rejected as anticipated by Wu; claims 65 and 66 were rejected as anticipated by McFarland; claim 5 was rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of Ejiri; claims 7, 8, 31, 33, 35-37, 39, 40 and 62 were rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of Baker; claims 10, 14, 32, 61 and 63 were rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of Shih; claims 16, 67-69 and 71-73 were rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of McFarland; claim 24 was rejected as unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Baker; claim 26 was rejected as unpatentable over Ejiri in view of Shih; claim 38 was rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of Baker; claim 44 was rejected as unpatentable over Wu in view of Kolenc; claims 46, 50, 51 and 55 were rejected as unpatentable over Wu in view of Baker; claim 48 was rejected as unpatentable over Wu in view of Weissgerber; claim 52 was rejected as unpatentable over Wu in view of McFarland; and claim 70 was rejected as unpatentable over Kolenc in view of McFarland.

Claims 23-25, 35-59 and 65-73 are canceled thereby obviating any rejections of those claims, however, Applicants do not acquiesce in those rejections and preserve the right to pursue the same or similar claim scope in a continuing application.

The specification has been amended to provide antecedent basis for claim 8. This amended language is from the patents that were incorporated by reference in paragraph 0023 and therefore there is no new matter.

Turning now to the substantive rejections, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1 and 60 is respectfully requested. The claims were rejected as anticipated by Kolenc. Claim 1 recites a “valve seat includes one or more protrusions wherein a portion of the valve body is crimped against said one or more protrusions to secure the valve seat to the valve body”. Claim 60 recites “providing one or more protrusions on one or more surfaces of said valve seat insert; and digging said one or more protrusions into at least one side wall of said valve body”. Kolenc has no such

structure or method step. The Kolenc seat is element F which does not have protrusions as claimed and is also made of plastic and therefore cannot be used in the method claimed in claim 60. Kolenc teaches nothing more than Fig. 1 of the present application which is identified as the prior art. The Office action identifies element 108 of Kolenc as being the protrusion, but 108 is part of the valve body, not the seat. The various dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 60 are patentable. Further comment is deferred pending reconsideration of the anticipation rejections.


Claim 17 is amended to recite that the valve seat insert comprises a low temperature carburized surface that is substantially free from carbides. The art of record and notably Ejiri do not teach such a seat and cannot anticipate the claim or its dependent claims as amended.

Claim 27 is amended to recite that the annular seat body comprises metal. As Kolenc is a plastic seat, Kolenc cannot anticipate the amended claim 27 or its dependent claims.

The application as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 01, 2007



Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176
Telephone: 216-622-8683